HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Chapel and College

Occasional Papers
of the
National Association of College and University Chaplains

Number Two

Autumn 1957

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/chapel-and-college_autumn-1957_2

Chapel and College

Occasional Papers
of the
National Association of College and University Chaplains
Number Two Autumn 1957

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"A Religious Perspective in Higher Education" ..... Page 3
SAMUEL B. GOULD, PRESIDENT OF ANTIOCH COLLEGE

"The Counseling of the College Chaplain" ..... Page 13
ROBERT BONTHIUS, CHAPLAIN OF VASSAR COLLEGE

Comments on "The Counseling of the College Chaplain" ..... Page 32
DANA FARNSWORTH, M.D., HARVARD UNIVERSITY
DANIEL W. WYNN, TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE
GEORGE H. BALL, HAMLINE UNIVERSITY

This is the second of a series of occasional papers published by the National Association of College and University Chaplains and intended to contribute to the effectiveness of college chaplains and of those in related positions. The response to the first issue indicated sufficient interest to encourage the Association to project a series of such papers.

The first article is the text of the Presidential Address at the 1957 Annual Conference of the Association, meeting at the University of Michigan in late April. It was delivered by Dr. Samuel Gould, President of Antioch College. There were many requests that it be published by the Association, and we are indebted to Dr. Gould for his permission to include it in "Chapel and College". It should be of interest not only to college chaplains but also more widely to college administrators and faculty.

The second article, "The Counseling of the College Chaplain", deals with one of the central and continuing problems of college chaplains. It raises the question of the specific characteristics, if such exist, of their counseling. It deals in particular with the sense in which their counseling

is "Christian".

This article was written by Dr. Robert Bonthius, Chaplain of Vassar College. He has participated widely in the discussion of the relations between theology and psychology, especially psychotherapy, and is the author of *Christian Paths to Self Acceptance.*

The comments on Dr. Bonthius' article have been written by members and friends of the Association and serve both to emphasize the importance of his article and to raise questions about it. Further comments from readers of "Chapel and College" are invited and should be sent to the Editor. They may, if of sufficient general interest, be included as editorial correspondence in a future issue of this journal.

Suggestions about the subject matter of future issues will be welcomed by the Committee on Publications. It is anticipated that one issue this year will mark the tenth anniversary of the founding of the Association, an event which will also be celebrated at the Annual Conference, to be held at Yale University from April 15 to 17, 1958.

The publication of this journal poses a continuing financial problem for the Association, but it is hoped by the Executive Committee that its usefulness will justify the expense and that the resources will be found to make its continued publication possible.

E. C. Reckard

Brown University
November, 1957

A RELIGIOUS PERSPECTIVE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

SAMUEL B. GOULD

President of Antioch College

I

While I am greatly honored by your invitation which brings me here tonight, I must confess to a certain amount of diffidence in addressing such a group as this on a subject in which you are all expert in knowledge and judgment. This is the area in which you work day by day and to which you give constant thought. Many of you are connected with institutions which have the closest kind of church relationship. I, on the other hand, am not only an unlettered layman in this field, but in addition represent a private, non-church-related college so liberal in its tradition that its fierce sense of individual freedom is sometimes misunderstood.

Yet, for the sake of the record, I should point out that Antioch was originally a church-related college, being founded by the Christian Church and deriving its very name from Biblical reference. And to keep history accurate, I must tell you that Antioch's eventual separation from the church was brought about not by any wave of anti-religious feeling but rather by a continuing struggle between the Christians and Unitarians for supremacy on her campus until the only solution even in their eyes turned out to be independence.

There seems to be a general misunderstanding (although I am sure it does not exist here) that if an institution labels itself as non-sectarian or non-church-related, it is directly or indirectly saying that it has no interest in religion and sees no value in studying it. Nothing could be further from fact. At Antioch, where all our courses in religion are elective, one out of every four students takes some course in religion. Furthermore, the number and variety of religious activities on our campus are amazingly extensive. Although statistics mean very little, it is interesting that in a single twelve-week period last year more than 81 different activities could be listed with a total attendance of about 2,100.

And remember that only about 650 of our students are ever on campus together during a period.

But I did not come here this evening to talk about Antioch College. You must forgive this occupational compulsion of a college president to drag his own institution into whatever his topic of discussion happens to be. As the lawyer said to the judge, according to Sam Weller in *Pickwick Papers,* when defending a man accused of beating his wife, "It is an amiable weakness, my lord." And besides, I wanted to present at least a reasonable set of credentials admitting me to this gathering and explaining my temerity in presenting my views to you.

II

In T. S. Eliot's poem, *The Rock,* there is a truly incisive picture of a secularist civilization. This is what Eliot says in a passage where the speaker is God:

> "A cry from the North, from the West and from the South
> Whence thousands travel daily to the timekept City;
> Where my Word is unspoken.
> In the land of lobelias and tennis flannels
> The rabbit shall burrow and the thorn revisit,
> The nettle shall flourish on the gravel court,
> And the wind shall say: 'Here were decent godless people:
> Their only monument the asphalt road
> And a thousand lost golf balls.'"

Decent, godless people. What a devastating phrase! And how pertinent it is to the controversy which goes on steadily as to whether religion has any place in higher education.

I need not remind you at any great length that the earliest European universities, those of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, were designed to train for the priesthood. The institutions which preceded them were the cathedral and monastic schools. Education was completely in the hands of the Church. One historian, Rashdall, reminds us, "In the Dark Ages Arithmetic and Astronomy found their way into the educational curriculum chiefly because they taught the means of finding Easter," [1] and even though the great universities of Bologna, Paris, Padua, Oxford, and Cambridge thought of the needs of lawyers and politicians, theology

1. H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages,* Vol. I, p. 35.

was still the dominating science. This was a situation continuing until relatively modern times and applying to America as well as to Europe.

Then came the almost shattering contributions of science, shattering in terms of what they did to the seemingly sturdy structure of the liberal arts and humanities. Life and life's meaning suddenly appeared to change. The influence of the scientific spirit reached into both material and non-material aspects of our culture. We were literally catapulted into an atomic age, with all its possibilities for good or evil. Dean Edwin Lee points out how on the non-material side this spirit is "exemplified in psychosomatic medicine and psychiatry, in the study of business cycles and social and economic trends, in penology and criminology, and in countless ways affecting profoundly the society in which we live." [2] He shows how penetrating has been this influence on education in particular, at all levels. He says:

> "The development has, in the main, been on four fronts. The first has been in the realm of educational psychology in which innumerable aspects of child life and behavior have been studied, with the result that any modern well-trained teacher knows vastly more about the children she teaches day by day than the wisest of those who taught us knew about us. From the first researches of Binet through those of Hall, Terman, Thorndike, Thurstone, Gesell, Stoddard, Gates — to name but a few — the scientific study of children and youth has given us not only ingenious tools, but insights and understandings which have profoundly influenced teaching at all levels...
>
> "The second development has been in the area of study and analysis of pupil achievement, out of which has grown the modern educational testing movement, with its methods and instruments which permit evaluating student performance and power fairly accurately...
>
> "Concurrently analyses and investigation in the area of the curriculum have occurred. Not only what should be included in a subject field, but how it should be taught, have become problems susceptible to scientific treatment...
>
> "The fourth area involves what may be called industrial research as applied to school matters — the analysis and designing of equipment, supplies, school buildings, and the like..." [3]

---

2. Edwin H. Lee, *These Things I Cherish*, p. 14.
3. Ibid, p.15.

The influence of science on education was therefore a secularizing influence. It placed such emphasis upon methodology that content, particularly liberal arts content, took a secondary position. It placed such emphasis upon techniques that a utilitarian purpose began to dominate education as never before. It led also to our present situation in which only a very small proportion of undergraduates of colleges and universities is preparing for service to the Church.

But this in no wise rules out the desirability and even the responsibility of the college for educating "for the service of God." Even though a youth is not studying for the ministry, there is no good reason why his studies should not prepare him for a life in which he recognizes the power of a Divine Being and his own place in the world because of that Divine Being. John Baillie, that eminent Scotsman, says quite rightly that "the service of God is not in competition with any worthy secular calling, but rather provides the ultimate setting in which that calling must be envisaged and pursued and the spirit in which it must be undertaken. And education for the service of God is not in competition with education in secular subjects, but provides the ultimate context and frame of reference which alone gives them the significance and the dignity they possess." [4]

Here, then, is the first point to be emphasized: the necessity for all education, regardless of its scientific or secular characteristics, to be education "for the service of God." If there is any single danger which modern higher education has faced in modern times it is the lack of a sense of direction. We are more highly organized; we are blessed or cursed with an almost infinite proliferation of courses; we pile knowledge upon knowledge, we test and measure and find percentages and medians, and we probe with what we think is scientific accuracy into the minds of our students; we are the busiest educators on earth but we don't appear to know where we are heading. "Never in any culture has intellectual life so lost the sense of ultimate destination as has the Western World during the last several generations. We have so much knowledge and so little wisdom — and knowledge without wisdom is not only futile but terribly dangerous." [5] So says the Principal of New College at the University of Edinburgh.

It is amazing and even frightening to watch the way we keep on acquiring knowledge without really knowing why. We are curious, and we want to make our lives more comfortable; yet neither of these two

4. John Baillie, *Education for the Service of God,* Address at Princeton University 1956, p. 14.
5. Ibid, p. 15.

motives can satisfy the spirit of man. There seems to be little about which we are willing to take a stand. Too much of our education today leads us toward "a condition of spiritual neutrality" without a proper underlying philosophy of life to give meaning and direction to studies. And we have cogent examples in our own lifetime of what this can portend.

Nazi Germany had a highly effective educational system. Before World War I, the German universities were at their peak in almost every department of learning. But simultaneously they had reached an unparalleled condition of spiritual neutrality. There was no basic and uniting philosophy, but rather a sort of vacuum at the center. Is it any wonder, then, that the intellectual life of Germany succumbed to the first strong philosophy of life to be presented, namely the Nazi ideology? As Dr. Baillie points out, "It has all now gone to dust and ashes, but surely it has taught us this lesson — that an exaggerated disinterestedness is likely in the end to fall victim to an intemperate and evil partisanship and that a rootless freedom of thought is likely to give place before very long to some new totalitarian bondage."

Today it is Communism which is challenging the intellectual life of the world, Communism with its many blandishments. It offers integration instead of confusion, direction instead of aimlessness, singleness of purpose instead of individualism. The only price we have to pay is slavery of the mind and soul for ourselves and for the generations to come. But the dangerously attractive quality in Communism to many has been that it is definite, robust, decidedly partial. What are we offering to students in its place? In democracy and in the Judeo-Christian ethic we have a better and nobler substitute, yet we are in danger of falling into the same spiritually neutral condition which brought Germany to her knees.

Nothing is more fearful than education which is effective but evil in purpose. One of the primary causes of today's international turmoil and today's consuming hatreds is that such education exists in the world today. The Russians distort the truths of biology and anthropology, they rewrite history and geography, they prostitute research and scientific method, and they do it so skilfully that a whole people has become an instrument of destruction. And all this comes about in a spirit of intense dedication, particularly in the youth, a dedication which, we are told by observers, seems to motivate their every thought and action. When an individual merges himself with a compelling cause, he can, if persuaded and taught well enough, collectively remake or destroy a nation. The tragedy of Russia is that its dedication is to a philosophy

and an ethic which are opposed to what free men hold to be true and good. The tragedy which may face America and others like us comes not out of our lack of belief but rather from what one man has called "the anemia of our dedication." [6]

Our spiritual neutrality shows itself regularly in the conduct of our foreign affairs. We talk much about the moral precepts on which our international policies are based, but in our efforts to be impartial rather than applying these precepts aggressively, we sometimes endanger the whole Western world. We content ourselves with a purely defensive approach, hastening to put out the political and ideological fires which the opposition cunningly and methodically sets in country after country, but remaining neutral otherwise. We never really enter the battle for peace aggressively with a complete and burning dedication to world morality and brotherhood. We talk of the moral forces necessary for peace, but our wealth and energy go into armaments rather than into the encouragement and strengthening of those moral forces. I do not question the need for armaments, nuclear or conventional; but I do question our unwillingness to be equally concerned about the state of men's minds. We need to be militantly moral as well as just militant; we need to be completely unneutral in working for the amelioration of suffering and the freedom of men. I do not question the belief in the supremacy of moral power or in the immorality of force; but I wonder whether there is much point in putting moral pressure on those who are essentially and philosophically immoral.

We have a rather similar kind of spiritual neutrality in many of our classrooms today. As teachers, we are so cowed by the implications of being considered partial that we take refuge in our complete objectivity about everything which could be challenged, whether politics, religion, or what you will. Is it any wonder that the American college has become such a sanctuary for sticking close to the facts, emphasizing the tangible and measurable, never adventuring beyond the already known except in the realm of the material? Is it any wonder that so many students who do not become bored or complacent become cynical? In the area of religion this is true again and again. In church-related colleges many of the students accept religion passively as a necessary but uninspiring concomitant of adult life. In non-church-related colleges many of them either reject denominationalism altogether or lean toward any ascetic, dispassionate cult based on science or logic, where faith and imagination can be traced to biological origins or where every human motive or aspiration can be explored, explained, and excused in Freudian terms.

---

6 Edwin H. Lee, *These Things I Cherish*, p. 17.

Teachers are sometimes fervent and passionate in their teaching, but usually about what they know and practically never about what they believe. They take very literally the accepted dictum that college years are for developing honest doubts and skepticisms. But in encouraging these, they fail frequently to raise the curtain on what may lie beyond, unexplainable, transcendent, but still strangely powerful in shaping an individual life or a whole civilization. Aldous Huxley, when asked what changed his early secular outlook to a later religious one, answered, "One reaches a point where one says, even of Beethoven, even of Shakespeare, 'Is this all?'" Truly, it is not all, and the curtain needs to be raised, not to make students religious in the traditional or denominational sense of the word, but to give their lives certain concrete qualities which most people can agree to be desirable.

III

Well, all I have said thus far is what you undoubtedly know already, for it is your primary function to know this — namely, the need for developing moral and spiritual values in American education, the need for stiffening the backbone of ethical resolve in youth, the need for humanizing and liberalizing education so as to give it direction and a robust philosophy which can withstand contemporary changes. But to know these needs is not enough. Indeed, the term "moral and spiritual values" is lobbed back and forth in educational circles like a tennis ball, but most of the volleying is to no purpose and very few aces are being served. What we really must know is, first, what such values really are, and second, how to teach them in the colleges and universities of America. Otherwise our dedication is of the anemic quality I mentioned a moment ago.

I cannot pretend to know the answers on these two points, especially to a group such as this. Yet I must offer what little has come out of my own reading and study and experience as a teacher and administrator. For even that little may be a clue to guide us in the search.

I like to think of the spiritual side of a college as a totality formed of a number of parts. And while I must admit that no one of this number can be "taught" in the rigid sense of the word, each can be present or lacking in every major or minor activity within a college whether undertaken by a teacher or pupil, individual or group.

The first of these parts, according to E. M. Ligon in his book, *Dimensions of Character,* is the stature of a man's vision. A man increases

his stature as he recognizes the inadequacies of his present dreams and envisions higher ones. He increases it with the recognition of his unique potential and the use of that potential in helping to meet the world's need. We should not forget that a youth's vision is at least as much a predicator of his future as is his native endowment.[7]

Vision alone, however, is not enough. It must be accompanied by a dominating purpose, developed by the person, not forced upon him. Let us not confuse this with good intentions. I am speaking of the kind of purpose which dominates one's actions. It can be measured by observing how much of what a person does consists of aimless behavior contrasted with how much goes into achieving some definite objective. It takes both vision and dominating purpose to describe the forcefulness of a man's behavior. One can have vision and be a visionary, accomplishing little. Or one can show much ado about very little. But one who, in college, gains a high vision of what he wishes to achieve and bends all his efforts to that end is profiting from the dimension of the spirit provided by that college in subtle or direct ways.

The second major part is the force of magnanimity. The dictionary defines this as,

> "Loftiness of spirit enabling one to sustain danger and trouble with tranquillity and firmness, to disdain injustice, meanness and revenge, and to act and sacrifice for noble objects."

The ability to rise above injustice and personal grievance is not easily obtained but it is worth working toward. The mature individual in his daily life needs to practice both self-expression and self-renunciation many times. "He will need to learn," as one biologist put it, "that to satisfy his deepest desires he will often have to deny his most superficial desires." The urge for autonomy on the part of the individual and the urge toward magnanimity are linked together when he learns that "true freedom has to be earned and carries with it proportionate responsibilities. The dignity and importance of the individual are guaranteed only when he accepts his role in society with all its restrictions as well as its privileges."

A third component of spirituality is faith. I am not concerned here with defending the theological implications of faith but am content to interpret it merely as man's belief in a friendly, orderly universe. This implies a determination to search even in evil for the good it can reveal, for one believes that the good is present. Scientists, although some may not wish to admit it, also have faith. Theirs is a belief that the universe

---

7. I am indebted for the ideas of this paragraph and the four which follow to E. M. Ligon's *Dimensions of Character*, pp. 213-268.

is governed by laws. It is this faith which makes them approach a problem over and over again in spite of repeated failures, never doubting that there is an answer. The great achievements of science during the last century testify to the power of such a faith.

Faith generates courage and optimism, both of which are necessary to the spirit. Certain types of physical courage are comparatively easy to inspire. But spiritual courage is more difficult. It may involve years, not moments; indefatigable patience, not bursts of heroism; continual optimism in the face of endless discouragement; the ability to face ridicule and misunderstanding, and similarly the ability to withstand the heady wine of popular acclaim.

I am saying, therefore, that a college or university should be spiritually alive in all that it undertakes formally and informally. But there is considerable doubt in some quarters that those elements which help to deepen spirituality can be taught in the classroom. I have some of this doubt myself. I wonder whether a student can be taught in the classroom to have vision and to increase the outreach of that vision as he recognizes his own potential. I wonder whether a student can be taught in the classroom to develop a dominating purpose in life, bending his every effort toward the achievement of his high vision. I wonder whether a student can be taught in the classroom to develop an attitude of magnanimity toward his fellow men, rising above injustice and personal grievance. I wonder whether a student can be taught in the classroom to have faith, the kind of faith which leads to a belief in a friendly, orderly universe. I wonder all these things and am not competent to answer, for documentary evidence which will show spiritual development through the classroom is meager and unsatisfactory.

But regardless of these wonderings, one fact I am reasonably sure about. It is that a college can teach its students in the area of the spirit by making of itself a continuing example in all that it does, an example of vision, dominating purpose, magnanimity, and faith with its accompanying courage and optimism. By what it does, as well as by what it says, it can be a constant guide to the individual. The tasks it undertakes and the reasons for those tasks, its patience and optimism in spite of the weighty problems which oppress it, its modesty in success and its unflinching steadfastness in failure, its adherence to the search for truth wherever the search may lead, — out of such day-to-day actions of a college or university, I believe, can come the realization by students that they can do likewise. As Huston Smith says:

> "Any college worthy of the name will have a spiritual life of its own which makes of it more than an assemblage of

> teachers, students, and buildings. At best it will have an atmosphere which is felt to be different from other environments the moment one steps into it and which acts as a powerful developing force upon all who live within it. Such an atmosphere will be like mist in the sense that one cannot put one's finger on it, but no one should be able to stay in it long without becoming thoroughly soaked." [8]

From the spiritual depths of the institution of learning can come the determination to make the conflict among men creative rather than destructive. As each tiny victory of the spirit is won daily in the college life, the roots of the enduring values for each individual grow deeper and stronger. He learns perhaps by imitation, but it is the highest form of imitation.

Most important of all, I am sure that spiritual values cannot be transmitted in a college except when teachers are themselves animated by large and noble views of life. No one expects the professor of engineering or economics or mathematics or even history to lecture on social ethics or faith in mankind or largeness of heart; but if he himself is the possessor of a sound philosophy of living and is convinced of the humaneness of learning, this will become evident in his classroom and other relationships with his students. They will see him not merely as a specialist but as a man who realizes that his real work is for the general good of humanity. They will recognize that they have been close to ethics and morality and sound thinking. They will even recognize sometimes that they have been close to greatness.

For the enduring wonder about education is that its subject matter eventually pales into insignificance. Out of the sifting and resifting of information, out of the discussion and rediscussion, out of the reading and reflection, emerges a specific residue not merely of knowledge but of wisdom. Otherwise education has been a failure. And this residue of wisdom is nothing more than the realization that a life to be worthwhile must be dedicated to noble purposes, to a compassion for one's brother wherever in the world he may be, to freedom of the mind and spirit, to a never-ending urge to understand more about life, and to the enhancement of the dignity of the individual as a creature of God. Religion in its many diversities can do much to bring about this kind of realization. It can quietly dispel the honest doubts of youth and substitute for them an uplifting and fulfilling creed for living and believing which puts the student on the tortuous but eminently rewarding pathway to a meaningful life.

---

8. Huston Smith, *The Purposes of Higher Education*, p. 189.

THE COUNSELING OF THE COLLEGE CHAPLAIN

ROBERT BONTHIUS

Chaplain of Vassar College

This article is based upon information obtained from college chaplains and upon personal experience. Some of the material was presented at the 1957 annual conference of the National Association of College and University Chaplains. A discussion followed on the question, "What makes the chaplain's counseling Christian?" This article and the accompanying comments upon it by others are intended to advance the discussion by summarizing what we know about the activity of chaplains as counselors, by considering a case of counseling by a chaplain, and by setting forth a conception of Christian counseling.

I

The Chaplain's Counseling Activity

Six years ago Seymour Smith gathered together an enormous amount of data from chaplains all over the country. The fourth chapter of his book, *The American College Chaplaincy,* presents the only description I know of counseling by chaplains. To learn more, I sent a questionnaire this spring to every fifth chaplain on the official 1957 membership list of the Association, fifty-four in all. Nine questions were asked, all of them "open-ended," that is, suggesting no particular group of answers (as check lists do, for instance). Some of the questions asked for facts about the chaplain's counseling activity in a way that might be compared with the Smith study. Other questions asked for opinions. The substance of each question will be clear from what follows.

Thirty-four chaplains responded but two of them explained that they did not fill out the questionnaire because they had left the chaplaincy. Four wrote letters about their counseling situation instead of filling out the questionnaire. However, these letters were informative and, wherever possible, I correlated the data they contained with that of the

twenty-eight completed questionnaires. Now we have fresh information, from a tenth of the American college chaplaincy at least, which can be used to validate or alter the picture of the chaplain as counselor which Smith has given us. In addition, we have some material from these chaplains which bears on questions not discussed in the Smith study.

The representativeness of the replies to my inquiry is not certain. The chaplains addressed were told that they could remain anonymous. Many of them did not sign the questionnaires. Thus, we do not know which institutions, and therefore which parts of the country, what kinds of program, and so on, the thirty-four respondents represent. I understand, however, that a fifth of any population is a good sample and that two-thirds of the sample responding is a good response. This much is certain: the fifty-four chaplains addressed are located in institutions large and small from Maine to California and from Texas to Minnesota. The thirty-four responding chaplains must represent a considerable variety of situations.

Chaplains vary widely in the amount of counseling they do. In response to my questions about the number of hours a week spent in individual counseling with students and the number of individual students counseled, some chaplains admitted that they do none at all. Some spend an hour or two a week with three or four different students. At the opposite extreme there are chaplains who claim to spend twenty-five to thirty hours a week in counseling with as many or more different individual students. Smith found a similar variation. The average amount of time devoted to counseling is eight hours a week with eleven different students, according to my respondents. This includes academic counseling but not counseling related to the religious activities program; program counseling. Smith found chaplains averaging nine hours a week (I cannot correlate his figures as to the number of individuals counseled with mine). This includes program counseling but not counseling related to academic work.

The average length of a counseling session is forty-five minutes, but here again there is great variety. Among my respondents, one averages ten hours a week with five different students, another spends ten hours a week with ten, a third sees twenty to thirty individuals a week in ten hours.

What are the problems students bring to the chaplain? First and foremost, they are religious ones. Virtually all of the chaplains in Smith's study (143 of them) and twenty-six in mine reported that students come

to get information, to discuss doubts, to ask theological and philosophical questions, to learn more about the Christian life. The emphasis among my respondents, and I judge among Smith's, seems to be upon the intellectual; most of the chaplains term these "Problems of Belief". Almost as many students take up academic problems with the chaplain, one hundred twenty-two of Smith's group and twenty-three of mine. Students have difficulty studying, they dislike their course work, they are dissatisfied with their major, they have clashes with faculty, they receive low grades. Third and last among the problems listed by the majority of my respondents (19) are those related to the opposite sex. The range of sex, love, and marriage problems is included here, but problems connected with interfaith marriages should be given special mention because they are so common. Smith found "courtship" problems mentioned by the majority (110) but not by as many as mentioned vocational problems (121). In fact, as many chaplains mentioned social adjustment (110) and general campus problems (110) as mentioned "courtship." The increase of opposite-sex problems indicated in my study is in line with a wide-spread opinion among personnel people that students today are more concerned about marriage than their predecessors.

Other problems are brought to some chaplains but not to the majority, as far as I can tell. Somewhat less than half of my respondents mentioned one or more of the following types: social adjustment problems (13) (which may include what Smith calls general campus problems), vocational problems (12), family problems (11), and what for lack of a better word I will call "personality" problems (11). Social adjustment problems have to do primarily with adjustment to peers, peer groups, and superiors. Chaplains give such examples as "fraternity or dormitory relations," "room mate difficulties," and "relations to students, faculty." Vocational problems have to do with the choice of career, suitability for a particular career, or preparation for a career. Here special mention should be made of the church-vocations counseling which chaplains often do. The duties of one chaplain, for example, included the supervision of student preachers. In this context, family problems are those connected with the student's relation to his parents and siblings. "Personality" problems are those which are primarily subjective. They have to do with inner conflict and its symptoms: guilt, fear, depression, loneliness, and illness.

While less than half the chaplains in my study mentioned social adjustment and "personality" problems, those who did usually put them at the top of the list, first in order of frequency. Evidently, chaplains have the

gamut of student difficulties as their field of counseling, at least potentially, and different chaplains attract students with different types of problems. The variety of problems brought to the chaplain argues for working relationships with all other counselors on campus. It is plain to see that chaplains have need of specialists in the various fields of counseling since they do not have time and training to deal adequately with them all. Since it can be assumed that the common problems (religious, academic, problems with regard to the opposite sex, social adjustment, and vocational) often root in "personality" problems, the peculiar importance of psychological sensitivity on the part of the chaplain is evident. Happily, chaplains are aware of this, as will be shown.

A glaring omission in my findings is that of program counseling. It is not listed by chaplains as a set of problems frequently dealt with. As a matter of fact, only one of my respondents even mentioned it. He put it at the top of the list! Smith's study shows that program counseling was mentioned by more than a third. Had I provided a check list, I think more would have mentioned it because most chaplains are responsible for directing religious activities programs. Probably they did not do so because I asked about the problems of "individual students." The chaplains did not think in terms of problems which are partly or mainly organizational. Still, there is no evidence in Smith's study that program counseling is one of the most frequent problems.

I followed Smith in questioning chaplains about the "channels" through which they came into counseling relationships with students — a metaphor which was not clear to everyone. Nonetheless, my respondents came through with a similar list of channels to that of Smith's.

Channels to Counseling

Smith's respondents	My respondents
1. Work with voluntary religious groups (143)	1. Classroom associations (16)
2. Classroom associations (113)	2. Informal, individual contacts on campus (15)
3. Referrals made by other students (111)	3. Work with voluntary religious groups (14)
4. Speeches and sermons (102)	4. Speeches and sermons (13)
5. Referrals made by college deans (86)	5. Referral of all types (10)

The notable difference between Smith's findings and mine has to do with the relative importance of work with voluntary religious groups and teaching as means of coming into counseling relationships. He

found that "standing out above all other channels are the associations developed within the voluntary religious groups."[1] I found that classroom associations were mentioned (once) more than work with voluntary religious groups, and, when I checked the responses of chaplains who mentioned both of these channels, I found there were twelve. Eight of these find classroom contacts more productive of counseling relationships than work with voluntary religious groups. Of course, both channels are important for chaplains. As one put it, "The formal preacher-pewsitter relation does not provide adequate contacts. Witness: most of the personal counseling I get develops out of the classroom or extra-curricular group contacts."

Informal, individual contacts on campus were not classified as such in Smith's study, but he notes, "chaplains in fairly large numbers took the trouble to write in the value of wide informal contacts on campus, referrals from housemothers and resident heads, and the chance meetings when a student 'happened to drop in.'"[2] While few chaplains do "pastoral calling" in the conventional form, many (more than half in my study) try to associate with students in phases of campus life not related to the religious activities program. They find this one of the best means of getting involved in counseling. They try to spend time mixing with students, be it at the local snack bar or at student body functions. One chaplain wrote, "I am an old-fashioned pastor who happens to be on the campus. I keep no record of my interviews and I have no idea of how much time I spend at it; certainly not as much as I should. But I do talk to a lot of boys. Most of it, however, is unscheduled, with a light touch, anywhere on the campus."

It may be that referrals made by other students and by college deans are important channels to counseling. I doubt it. My respondents do indicate that students who are referred to them are frequently referred by fellow students. (More chaplains mentioned referrals from faculty than from students. (19 to 16). But of those chaplains who mentioned both, the majority said that students refer more frequently than faculty.) The point is that only one third of the chaplains I questioned listed referrals as a channel to counseling. Chaplains do not get many referrals from all referral sources put together. Most students come to them of their own accord. Five of my respondents specifically stated that no one on campus ever refers students to them. As for college deans referring students to the chaplain, a minority (10) of the chaplains in my group

1. Seymour A. Smith, *The American College Chaplaincy* (New York: Association Press, 1954), p. 98.
2. Smith, p. 99.

mentioned them. Nineteen mentioned faculty. Sixteen mentioned students. Sixteen mentioned other counselors.

The subject of other counselors leads to the question of the chaplain's relationship to them. A decade and a half ago, Robert Rankin found that "the official personnel agencies and the religious organizations are operating within their own spheres, quite unaware of one another." [3] A decade ago, Cuninggim was able to report a definite increase of interest on the part of personnel people not only in providing for counseling on the problems of religion but in religious counseling, that is, providing help to the student in developing his value system. Six years ago, Smith found that chaplains were not satisfied with their relationships to other counselors on campus even though the religious interest of the other counselors might have grown. Today, according to the chaplains I questioned, the majority are basically happy with these relationships because there is a working arrangement with the personnel people on campus. Most chaplains know the other counselors personally, and they have confidence in their abilities. There seems to be respect for one another's special fields. They refer students to each other. Here is an ideal situation: "I am satisfied with the present relationship, first, because the presence of other counselors means that students who do not come to me will go to someone and can probably find someone in whom they have confidence. Also the fact that there are counselors on campus who have special training, such as in psychology, means that it is possible to refer special cases to them. A third relationship that is very satisfactory is that the other counselors try as far as possible to refer those with serious spiritual problems to me."

A third of the chaplains in my study indicated dissatisfaction with the general counseling situation. The principal complaint is that the counseling is not coordinated. As one described it, "No real coordination of work. University has Psychological Counseling Center. We should have periodic staff meetings, make cooperation specific and explicit." Some chaplains believe that the faculty and the administration are not sufficiently concerned with counseling. A few have more personal problems: they feel that the other counselors on campus are inadequate, or that they themselves are, or that other duties keep them from more and better counseling.

Whether or not today's chaplain is an official personnel officer, he appears in most cases to have achieved cooperative relationships with

---

3. Robert Rankin, *Relation of Student Personnel Work to Religion in Higher Education* (M.A. thesis, Yale, 1942), p. 15, quoted in Merrimon Cuninggim, *The College Seeks Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947), p. 179.

those individuals and agencies on campus who are charged with the business of counseling.

How does the chaplain's counseling differ from that of his non-clerical colleagues? The Smith study does not deal with this question. The principal differences mentioned by the chaplains I questioned are, first, the type of problem brought to the chaplain (15), and, second, the way he deals with a problem, whatever it is (10).

The chaplains who say that they get different types of problems generally refer to religious problems, social adjustment, and "personality" problems. The following statement is typical: "I am likely to get the puzzling academic problems when the reasons for the difficulties are not apparent...personal problems are likely to come...if, the student knows me; sometimes difficult personal problems, especially in relation to parents, other students, girl trouble, homosexuality, etc., come to me or are referred by other faculty members...Religious problems...other than routine Catholic problems...come to me."

Judging by these responses, the chaplain deals with some of the student's most intimate and ultimate questions. The chaplain is not only the counselor most likely to discuss theological and practical religious matters with the student, he is frequently faced with students who are depressed, confused, anxious, and at odds with themselves and life. If the chaplain were to be placed on a counselor's continuum running from social role problems at one end to inner-conflict problems at the other, he would be nearer the inner-conflict end. (At the other end would be the academic advisor, the deans, the disciplinary officers. In the middle there would be the vocational counselor and the study counselor.) The chaplain's work as a counselor overlaps that of all other counselors, perhaps, but it is most closely related to that of the consulting psychologist and the psychiatrist. At least, that is the way at least half the chaplains I questioned seemed to see it. Apparently most of those who have psychological specialists on campus refer their more disturbed cases. A chaplain writes, "I am sometimes the first step on the road to more intensive counseling, for men who are unable to face the depths of their own problems." Those who do not have psychological or psychiatric personnel on campus have to content themselves with supportive measures.

Clearly the chaplain has to deal frequently with profound problems, problems involving the whole person. In doing so, does he have any unique contribution? Only a third of the chaplains in my study declared that their method or approach to student problems differs from that of

their non-clerical colleagues. The most unequivocal statement was this one: "The help I would give a student is basically different from other sources of help -- mine is based on the student's finding the right relationship with God in Christ. I have found that most problems are solved when this is done." What seems to be meant by the minority of chaplains who believe that theirs is a unique method of dealing with problems is that they stress the relationship to God. They appear to be quite directive in their counseling, making interpretations of the problems presented in more or less traditional Christian terms and proferring advice based upon the Church's teaching. As one chaplain explained, "I speak from the Hebraic-Christian tradition whereas some of my colleagues often leave this out. 'Repentance,' 'forgiveness,' 'love' sometimes is not in their vocabulary."

The majority of chaplains did not indicate that there is any difference in their method or approach to a student. Four chaplains specifically stated that there is no difference between them and their non-clerical colleagues either in the types of problems they meet or their method of dealing with them. "In practice, I do not think there is a great distinction between clerical and non-clerical counseling here except for the attitude of the counselee who chooses a clerical person instead of a non-clerical one. From my information, the counselors here are handling many of the same problems and there is little specialization."

Considering all the personal problems brought to chaplains, it is not surprising that they feel inadequate on the psychological side. Their training has been primarily theological and ecclesiastical. The two needs that chaplains mention repeatedly are training and time. A check of my respondents who do an average or better than average amount of counseling shows that twelve of the eighteen feel the need of more knowledge about personality development and/or instruction in the art of counseling. (Not as large a proportion of those who do less than the average amount of counseling express such need.) Several chaplains are making plans for graduate work in the field of counseling. Others would like to take additional work. "I am aware of inadequate background in counseling, even though I have had work at summer (sic!) mental hospitals and in Seminary in this direction. I feel like a beginner in the field when I buck up against the concrete personal problem." One chaplain reported that he takes up specific cases with the psychology professors at his institution.

The need for more time is immediately understandable. What chaplain does not want "more time spent with students, less in running the mechanics...?" Few chaplains mentioned any other needs. Four in-

dicated in one way or another that the amount of course work they had was so great as to interfere with counseling. One of these men teaches sixteen hours a week! Three said what they needed was more love, or more patience, or more understanding. Some chaplains stress the need for the improvement of relations with other counselors; one or two mentioned the need for additional personnel, e.g., a psychiatrist. Needs not mentioned by more than one chaplain were: office space, counseling literature, contact with other chaplains who are counseling, more appreciation of the chaplain's role by the administration, and a clearer understanding on campus that he was available as a counselor.

In conclusion, most chaplains today are engaged in counseling to a limited extent. However, judging by the time chaplains say they spend in counseling, by the number of students seen, and by the total impression which their responses leave, it does not appear that "It is now being recognized that counseling must be at the heart of any vital campus religious program."[4] Should it be at the heart? In any case, it is not the heart, only one of the limbs.

Most of the counseling the chaplain does is not only about religion but religious, that is to say, it has to do with the student's struggle to find that which is ultimately important in life. For the most part, chaplains find that the difficulties are of an intellectual nature, but a significant minority of the problems appear to be rooted in emotional conflict.

The conditions which Cuninggim found necessary for adequate religious counseling are not everywhere present:[5] (1) thorough training in pastoral psychology: this is still needed by many chaplains; (2) sufficient freedom from other duties: there seem to be few chaplains who are not loaded with other duties – time! (3) suitable office space: only one man mentioned this difficulty; (4) integral relation to the total counseling program: the majority of chaplains report active if not official relationships to the other counselors on campus. As regards the last-named condition, it appears that the chaplain's situation has been markedly improved in recent years.

4. Cuninggim, p. 282.
5. See Cuninggim, p. 282.

II

A Case of Counseling by a Chaplain

This account of a two-session, counseling relationship is provided with the permission of the student for the purpose of advancing the discussion about Christian counseling. Does the fact that the chaplain is a believing Christian and one who is commissioned to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ make any difference in his counseling? Should it? How? What makes counseling Christian?

I did not select a religious problem, as described in this paper,[6] because such problems offer the chaplain obvious opportunity to talk about Christian faith and life. I do think it wise for the chaplain to consider the possibility that a student's religious problem is not the basic difficulty. Carroll Wise goes so far as to say that "the majority of the problems expressing themselves in religious questions arise as a result of emotional conflict rather than on a strictly intellectual basis." [7] Still, there certainly are problems which are primarily intellectual, and these can be dealt with by the educational approach.

The case presented here was a "personality" problem from the start, and therefore one which required the counseling approach. As I hope the case and the discussion which follows will make clear, the counseling approach is basically different from the educational (the one in which the minister is trained). The basis of the difference is this: the counseling approach is to help the individual understand, accept, and direct himself; the educational approach is to enlighten the individual about objective matters which the educator believes are relevant to the individual's problem and which should interest him.

The student came unreferred. She said she was bothered by certain situations in which she had been criticized. She apologized for talking about a matter so trifling but she was annoyed and she wanted to talk with someone. The chaplain indicated that no problem was unimportant in his book and invited her to tell him more about it.

Three instances of criticism in the past several months were cited. One of them the student had talked over with the chaplain earlier. However, the student's question was then objective: What should she do about the girl who offended her? (She decided to defend herself and

---

6. See above, p. 3.

7. Carroll A. Wise, *Pastoral Counseling Its Theory and Practice* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 219.

did the best she could.) That was a case of public criticism by a high school acquaintance who ridiculed her for not making a more outstanding record in college after she had been voted "Most likely to succeed" by her graduating class. It still rankled in her mind. The second instance occurred during a recent seminar in her major field, religion. The professor asked her to explain a broad statement she had made. She tried, but she could not do so to her satisfaction or to his. She felt that the professor disdained her knowledge of the field. Shortly after that, she went to him privately and criticized him for his conduct. A third instance occurred when she fell into conversation with a fundamentalist minister who doubted that she was a Christian because she could not point to a conversion experience. She found it difficult to defend the idea that she was a Christian. The conversation ended with a tirade on his part against the whole idea of religious education and especially the religion taught in colleges.

Each of these encounters was unexpected. Each ended in defeat for her. The student was humiliated. None of them was important (at least she wanted to feel that none was important) yet each disturbed her deeply at the time and continued to bother her. She looked to the chaplain for insight and guidance, she said.

The disclosure of this much of the problem took the better part of one session. Mainly the chaplain listened as she talked. At one or two points he summarized what she had said to make sure he had the gist of it, and looked to the student for correction, comment, and elaboration. At the end of the session the chaplain complimented the student on her effort to work through her negative feelings. He said he believed she had hold of something that might be of importance in her further growth, and that more understanding might come if she wished to discuss the problem further. She made another appointment.

A week later the chaplain greeted her in his office and asked how things were going. The problem continued to bother her, she said, and she was not sure she had anything more to add to what she had said the week before. A brief review of the situation and her feelings with regard to it was given by the chaplain; this elicited nothing more. So he put forward a suggestion, more or less in the form of a question, something for the student to determine the relevance of: Did all three of the incidents have something in common? In each case was there a threat to her status as a well-educated and therefore superior person?

The response was immediate and positive. The student commented at length about her feeling of inferiority as a person, and her need to

find status in her own eyes and in the eyes of others. She had chosen the college she did because it was top-flight. She had done better than average work while here. It might be that she had tried to make herself believe she was better than others because of her educational position. Perhaps the public ridicule of a high school acquaintance, who had not even gone to college at all, made her anxious because it showed that she had not impressed a person that she should have been able to impress. The questioning of a professor in the field of her supposed superiority disclosed her weakness to him, to her peers in the seminar and to herself. She had thought she was a better Christian (something which meant much to her) because of her activities at this particular college and her religion major. But a Christian minister had roundly denied all this, and left her with the feeling that she must be a superficial Christian or none at all. So she reflected.

The chaplain asked, after these connections had been made, whether perhaps she had been basing her sense of personal worth on her social position. Had she rather assumed that she was a more successful person because she was doing well at a fine institution of higher learning? He recalled a chapel talk she had given earlier in her career in which she had deplored the poor impression students of this college make on outsiders, and how she had pled for more responsible and democratic conduct toward outsiders so that the college would have a better reputation.

The student remembered this talk well and reflected that his comment was probably true. In fact, the more she thought about it, the more she realized that she had been "using" her educational position as an assurance that she was somebody. The three criticisms had disturbed the idea that she was a real person simply because of the college she went to. Taken together, they had threatened the social, the intellectual, and the spiritual status that she thought she had achieved.

Commending this sustained effort of the student to see herself as clearly as possible, the chaplain summarized the situation as it now appeared. She was, it seemed, in the humiliating position of not being as significant in the eyes of (some) others as she liked to think she was. This was brought home to her by the three antagonists. Small wonder that she had been angry with them and disturbed about herself.

The student was visibly spent by the recognition. Already, she said, she could see many other ways in which she had been striving to overcome feelings of inferiority by the prideful use of her educational position. It was very depressing, she confided, to see that this affected so many of her relationships.

The chaplain said that he believed every recognition of this sort was a gain. It contributed to a realistic estimate of herself and her abilities, and a less censorious attitude toward others who crossed her. It might very well make her less vulnerable to the criticisms of others. (The chaplain's mention of her censorious attitude was uncalled for, since she had not expressed concern about this. More important, it was a judgment of her. In general, responses of this type may be expected to block further disclosure on the part of the counselee. Much of this sort of thing would destroy the counseling relationship altogether.)

The student wondered whether she could accept herself as she was. How could she avoid despair, when she realized what she had been? (This was at the end of the session.) The chaplain observed that he expected depression to follow such realization as had come to her, but that he believed this would be temporary.

The session closed with the student's resolution to look more critically at her reactions. It might be, she ventured, that she would not need to think of herself in such superior terms, and she might not be so shaken by people who questioned her significance. At least this was something to work on.

III

What is Christian Counseling?

Perhaps there is nothing Christian about this counseling — at least, nothing obviously so. The chaplain did the sort of thing a non-clerical counselor might do. We need not contend that he did as good a job as a man trained in the approach, such as a consulting psychologist or a psychiatrist. The point is that he proceeded in the usual, one might say secular, way. The focus was on the student and her problem. The specific difficulty was investigated in detail. While the counselor shared the burden of the inquiry, he did not take it over. The student was expected to do most of the talking, since it was her problem and it was assumed that she knew most about it. The counselor apparently felt that his job was to help her find out as much as she could about it, and to this end he listened, summarized, asked questions intended to stimulate further inquiry, and otherwise encourage her to delve beneath the surface of the problem. Since he wished to help the student bring out everything that was relevant, the counselor refrained (not altogether successfully) from making moral judgments about her attitudes and the conduct. He did

not arrest the inquiry by assurances that things weren't so bad, that they would certainly be all right, or that she should not think about these things. He put the emphasis upon examination of the problem.

When it came to the point at which the student felt there was nothing more to say about the problem, the counselor proferred no solution, ready-made or ad hoc. Evidently, he expected the student to come up with her own answer. It may be assumed that he would have mentioned alternative ways of dealing with her problem had she overlooked one which seemed to him important, but he would have mentioned this only as a possibility for her to consider. He would not have tried to "sell" it to her. For the responsibility of deciding what she would do must remain at all times with her.

The approach in this case is common to counselors of all schools which deal primarily with the inner-conflict type of problem. Their differences as to details of methodology and interpretations of psychodynamics should not obscure the common elements in their approach to individuals in trouble. It is explorative and explicative of basic feelings and attitudes. It might even be called diagnostic, making use of sympathetic rapport between the counselee's immediate problem and his underlying desires. The idea is to expand the awareness of the individual concerning the real factors in his own psychic structure; he must do the re-directing as he finds out more of what he is working with.

Because there is nothing obviously Christian about this approach, shall we say that there is nothing Christian in it? It appears to me that there is something profoundly Christian in this way of helping people. First, the spiritual (I hesitate to use this word but cannot find a more suitable one) quality of the relationship that may exist between the counselor and the counselee invites attention. Second, the character changes which counseling sometimes affects should be of interest to the Christian.

The spiritual quality of any particular interpersonal relationship is intangible. Yet it is perhaps the most influential factor in the relationship, more important, for example than the ideas that are exchanged. Nowhere is this more evident than in the relationship of counseling. To the extent that a counselor is genuinely (not compulsively) interested in helping a person to find and to deal more constructively with whatever is blocking his growth, and to the extent that he has developed the science and the art of counseling, a relationship may be established which has some of the qualities of profound love. Hans Prinzhorn, an eminent British psychotherapist, has declared that the "effective agent" in psychotherapy is this: *"that the therapist, in virtue of the Eros paidogogos which in-*

spires him, helps, as mediator, from the isolation that is full of fear, to wholeness of life, to new comradeship, to the world, perhaps to God. Without this form of the erotic, no psychotheraputic curative action is possible."[8]

The love relationship which makes effective counseling possible is not sentimental. If it is to be called "love" it will have to be thought of in terms that do not titillate. It is a basic respect for the person. The counselor demonstrates it in many ways: in giving his time, in the willingness to listen (how often a student expresses warm "thanks for listening"), in the desire to understand the problem, in the acceptance of the person regardless of what he reveals, in the evident belief that the individual has the ability to work through to clearer understanding and a more constructive management of life, in the freedom that is given to make decisions, and in the confidence implied by the counselor as he submits whatever interpretations or suggestions he may have to the final judgment of the counselee.

Such love may be experienced in the counseling relationship. To the extent that it is, something of the "truth" of God is being communicated to the person in difficulty. Emil Brunner has clearly exposed the misunderstanding of Christian truth which makes it a set of supernaturally revealed facts about God. He has shown that what is meant by "truth" in Christian sense is right relationship between God and man. As he puts it, "Truth is meeting"[9]: it is the active response of the whole person to the outgoing love of God for him. Such "meeting" is always mediated. It occurs in and through human fellowship, notably, the Church, and in connection with the Word of God. But can "meeting" take place in non-Biblical ways? We are face to face with the question of general revelation. Can the love of God be mediated in, let us say, the meeting of counselor and counselee? It appears to me that the counseling relationship can be one of love in profound measure. And that, when this is the case, the truth of God is received, though the idea of God is never mentioned.

The summary statement of Carroll Wise on this point seems to me to be one to ponder. "If the situation is one where the basic relationship is that of love in the sense of seeking the fulfillment of the personality of the counselee, then God does not have to be brought into the situation; God is in the situation. If the phrase 'God is love' has any vital significance at all,...it means that God is present in human experiences when

---

8. Hans Prinzhorn, *Psychotherapy* (London: Cape, 1932), p. 332. (Italics in the original.)

9. Emil Brunner, *The Divine-Human Encounter*, trans. Amandos W. Loos (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1943).

those realities which are a fundamental part of His nature are finding expression in human relationships." [10]

Not only can the love of God be experienced in counseling, the fact of sin in the sense of living against reality and being responsible for it can be experienced, too. This is one of the least recognized connections between counseling and moral theology, largely, I believe, because of semantic complexities surrounding the word "sin." Counseling can increase the individual's awareness of his own responsibility for the evil he deplores.

This happened in the case presented in this paper. The further the student delved into her difficulty the more clearly she saw that it was not merely a matter of being wronged. She came to realize that these attacks of others had revealed her pretensions. She had built up an idealized image of herself as a very well-educated young woman. Without contending that she got to the bottom of things in two sessions(!), it seems that she did come to a fuller realization of the part she herself played in her difficulty. A good half of the second session was spent in the examination of various ways in which she had been trying to prove that she was significant. At the end of it, the student knew that the difficulty was more within herself than she had expected it to be. She not only admitted this, but she was resolved to do what she could about it.

This seems to me to be a case in which the counseling approach helped a student to "confess her sin" and "repent of her evil ways." But to mention such terms is to realize how inappropriate they are. She was not thinking in these terms. Had the chaplain, after listening to her awhile, begun a diagnosis even in more sophisticated theological terms and presented a theological solution, we may be quite sure that she would have been stopped in her tracks. Suppose he told her something like this: that he could see she had a problem and he wanted to help her; that he had been watching her for some time and had seen that she was afflicted by pride and hostility; that he knew God would help her to overcome it, help her to be humble so that she would not be hurt by the criticisms of others and gentler in her dealings with others; that it was really a problem of her relationship to God; and so on. Would she not have reacted defensively, as she did with the fundamentalist minister? It was precisely because the chaplain refrained from taking over the problem that she continued to wrestle with it herself and thus became aware of its implications for her. Once she had seen this, she needed no one to tell her that she would have to change.

---

10. Wise, pp 154-155.

The attempt to "Christianize" counseling by diagnosing and prescribing in theological or evangelistic terms will be self-defeating to the extent that it blocks the individual's own communication of the problem. If it does, it will block his understanding of his own part in his difficulty and what he might do about it. It changes the quality of the whole relationship when the counselor takes charge and begins to plump for his way of seeing things. It becomes a relationship not of communication but of persuasion, as though the chaplain were saying, "I've tried to understand you and your problem. I do. In fact, I see it more clearly than you do. Now listen to me." One chaplain stated in his questionnaire that he believed "most problems are solved" when he leads the student into right relationship to God in Christ. That seems to be saying that in most cases he knows what the student needs before he starts counseling. (We may be happy that he does not think he knows in all cases.) If this is the situation, why counsel at all? It isn't counseling. For counseling is based upon the premise that only the counselee can finally determine what he wants and needs and he alone can right matters. If that is true, then the counselor's solutions are at best too general and at worst irrelevant; in any case, they prevent the one thing a troubled individual needs most of all: a relationship in which he has an unhurried chance to see himself as he is and to decide what he's going to do about it. Such a relationship can be an authentic Christian contribution of the chaplain.

Having stressed the importance of keeping the focus on the counselee's perception of his situation and his plans to deal with it, it should be pointed out that there are occasions in the counseling process when the counselor can help by introducing facts or ideas. It sometimes appears that the counselee would be able to use a piece of information, a suggestion, an opinion, or a bit of encouragement. While all counselors do not agree, it seems to me appropriate and helpful to do this if it promises to help eliminate a groundless fear, clarify an objective aspect of the counselee's situation, or aid him in thinking in broader and more inclusive terms about the courses of action he might take. But such materials must be introduced sparingly, if at all, and for the purpose of increasing the individual's capacity for a more realistic handling of his problem. They must be presented simply as something which the counselee might want to know about or take into consideration. Otherwise, communication will be impeded or stopped.

In the counseling situation, too, I think there are times when the Christian minister can effectively relate what has been happening in the counseling relationship to Christian faith and life, provided he is quite sure that something significant has happened. Such connections made by the chaplain may open up new vistas to the counselee; they may be the

means of his seeing the relevance of Christianity; they may suggest the significance of participation in the corporate life of the Church or in the religious activities program or make such participation more meaningful.

This was not done in the case presented -- another possible criticism of the chaplain's procedure. At the end of the second session, the chaplain might have mentioned that the experience of critical self-evaluation that the student had undertaken was a vital form of what Christians mean by confessing one's sin. And, the feeling that she now had that she could work constructively with the problem and might not be overwhelmed by it was part of what Christians mean by the forgiveness and the power of God in human life. Out of his experience, Wise observes: "Many of the concepts in the Christian tradition refer directly to universal and basic human experiences. Calling this fact to the attention of the counselee often has the effect of helping him see the relation of his experience to that of others, and helps to develop a sense of fellowship and understanding." [11] The caveat is: be sure that interpretation follows experience.[12]

The second significant thing about counseling, from the Christian point of view, has to do with the character changes it affects. It is commonly imagined that counseling helps explain an individual's difficulties to him but gives him no power to overcome them. I am convinced that this is a serious misconception. For one thing, counseling as understood in this paper is not a purely intellectual process. It involves the emotions fully as much as it involves the mind. Indeed, one might say that counseling is the use of the mind for the purpose of understanding and controlling the emotions. "Explanations," or rather, interpretations, of inner conflict are not the concern of the experienced counselor except insofar as they may be of use to the counselee in clarifying his real feelings. As one such counselor has written recently, *"The fundamental human problems do not lie in the region of the intellect. They lie in the region of our personal needs and our emotional relationships and they concern our basic satisfactions, fulfillments and frustrations in living.* We shall be closer to the heart of the human problem if we think not of 'Guiding the Perplexed' but of 'Succouring the Unloved.' What we need to know is how to remedy the ravages in human nature due to deprivation of love." [13]

It can be claimed, I think, that counseling does change some people, in other words, that some are empowered by it. Obviously, empirical

---

11. Wise, p. 141.

12. "Religious experience produces the interpretation; the interpretation never produces the experience," Wise points out (p. 220).

13. Henry Guntrip, *Psychotherapy and Religion* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p 20. (Italics in the original.)

proof of the sort that will convince the sceptic is hard to come by. I will simply observe that counseling not infrequently results in tendencies like those that appear in the case here presented: more honesty about oneself, more acceptance of the mixture of strength and weakness in the self, more confidence that one can live with oneself and others despite one's limitations, and greater flexibility or readiness to entertain the notion that one's difficulties in the world may be of his own making.

Such results of counseling, if we can assume that that is what they are, should be of considerable interest from the Christian point of view. They are very like some of the fruits of the Spirit which the Apostle Paul describes. If the counseling relationship is a profound experience of love, we should not be surprised to find that awareness of one's needs is facilitated by it and also the increased will to cope with them. According to Christianity, spiritual growth occurs when the individual meets with divine (outgoing) love.

What has been set forth here does not imply that counseling is the full and sufficient means of communicating God's truth to man. Counseling is at best an implicit and partial experience of God's love and man's need. Ideally, it should be carried on in the context of a full-orbed ministry in which the individual's struggle for the fulfillment of life is given continuous support and increasing clarification both in the corporate life of the church and in the civil community. And this is facilitated by many means other than counseling. As Karen Horney used to say, "Life has many therapies." From the standpoint of Christianity's conception of human beatitude, it is inconceivable that anyone could be adequately served apart from the fellowship of believers, which includes the hearing of the Word, the reception of the sacraments, corporate and private worship, study, and prayer.

It is fitting and proper, therefore, that the chaplain spend most of his time in these educational activities. If he seeks to develop the science and the art of counseling, it should be out of the twin convictions, first, that some of the problems students bring to him cannot be dealt with by ordinary educational means and, second, that the counseling approach can in and of itself be used of God.

Comments on

THE COUNSELING OF THE COLLEGE CHAPLAIN

I

Dana L. Farnsworth, M.D.
Director, University Health Services
Harvard University

A college chaplain has one great advantage over other counselors on a college campus and that is that students know what he stands for and how he views their experience — or they think they do. Therefore, when a student comes for help, the chaplain does not have to spend time explaining his position. Full attention may be directed to helping the student understand his own situation and his inner reactions to it. When a student realizes that a person he deeply respects, and who is a member of a profession that might be expected to have rather fixed views on human quandries, can and will take the time to think through a problem with him, without moralizing or passing judgment, the healing effect is great indeed.

This article brings out rather clearly the principle that much of the personal counseling done by the chaplain seems on the surface to have little relationship to his theological training. Yet the fact that the chaplain is the one who has gained enough of the confidence of the student to cause him to come for help is of encouraging significance. Of equal import is the fact that many of the students who consult the chaplain are deeply disturbed emotionally. All this suggests that a college chaplain should not only be keenly aware of the nature of emotional conflicts but that he have easy channels of communication with other counselors on the campus — particularly the psychiatrist and clinical psychologist.

In dealing with students who may have a wide variety of emotional problems, a chaplain-counselor is often faced with a dilemma in which his own role may become diffused. Shall he always act like a chaplain, should he act like a psychiatrist at times, or should he vacillate back and forth between these roles? How can he control his own anxiety as he is

faced with numerous psychological problems which defy immediate or even final complete understanding?

Fortunately a chaplain who does a great deal of counseling does not have to become an amateur psychologist or psychotherapist to do effective counseling. He does need to acquire some knowledge of the main facts and principles concerning personality development and how people relate themselves to one another, together with a life-long desire to add to this knowledge constantly. These are precisely the same facts and principles that should be in the common possession of all teachers and all those who deal with people as they struggle to better themselves and the communities in which they live.

Whether counseling is Christian or not is of far less importance than the fact that a Christian is doing it. When students see Christian ministers exercising compassion and understanding in counseling situations, without aggressive furtherance of the Christian point of view, a truer and deeper understanding of Christianity is likely to ensue than if they are confronted with dogmatic answers which may or may not seem relevant.

II

Daniel W. Wynn
Chaplain
Tuskegee Institute, Alabama

Mr. Bonthius' paper is informative and a contribution to our knowledge of counseling as it is done by college chaplains.

While his paper reflects great merit, we feel that it could have been strengthened at three points. In the first place, the paper would have been strengthened if the researcher had devised some means of making his facts more representative in terms of location, kinds of program and the like. The fact that this lack of representativeness was acknowledged suggests the possibility that he would also acknowledge it as a weakness. Yet, we realize that this is a difficult thing to do when the respondents are permitted to remain anonymous, which is often necessary for a good return. It might have been helpful had he asked questions which would have thrown some light upon the type, size, and nature of the institutions represented and the general geographical region in which they were located as, e.g., South, Southwest, North, East, etc.

The counseling case is another point of possible weakness from the

point of view of the follow-up. The case was handled well up to this point and was well worthy of recommending for review and consideration. We felt, however, that when the student resolved to look more critically at her reactions and to cease viewing herself in such superior terms as to be shaken by those who questioned her significance, the chaplain should have conducted some sort of follow-up to determine how well she was able to keep her resolution.

It is possible that this was done but not reported in this case. Even so, it would have to be conjectured rather than observed by the reader and for that reason may not carry the instructional or informative significance that it would otherwise carry.

The final point that we would like to examine may not be so much a weakness as a matter of semantics, or a difference of opinion with respect to the researcher's concept of "Christian counseling" and "counseling which may be secular."

It appears that Christian counseling for the researcher involves making moral judgements about a counselee's conduct and attitudes. It is assumed by intimation that such judgements would be directive and based on some sort of moral standard which one might call Christian.

Since the Christian tradition holds to the view that all human personality is sacred and that all human beings have worth, dignity, and value in the sight of God, the mere process of playing a part in restoring or developing a self into a harmonious relationship with itself and God may be Christian. The elimination, dissolution or understanding of an inner problem or conflict is as much a fulfillment of the will of God as the elimination or understanding of a conflict between the inner self and an outward code, creed, or moral standard. Because Christianity is concerned with the whole man and his harmonious relationship with God, anything which thwarts the harmony of this relationship is a moral problem. Anyone who helps to eliminate this problem, whether psychologist or minister, is a tool in the moral process.

We agree with the researcher in his emphasis on love in the counseling relationship. In fact, the only successful counseling relationship is based on love (agape), irrespective of how detached it may appear or have to be. This truth alone is sufficient to make all counseling moral.

Our basic disagreement at this point is that the researcher seems to feel that the counseling relationship can be one of love in a profound measure while we feel that the relationship *must* be one of love to be a success. The researcher seems to make God and love optional require-

ments for the successful counseling relationship, but it is our opinion that God and love (agape) are the same in the relationship. They differ only when it becomes necessary to give them some sort or theological rationalization or to intellectualize them. In such cases the counseling process is substituted for instruction.

Although we agree with the researcher that an attempt to "Christianize" counseling by diagnosing and prescribing in terms which are theological or evangelistic is self-defeating, we go further in the belief that there is no such thing as Christianizing counseling except in the sense that the presence of love in the relationship and the recognition of the sacredness, worth, and dignity of the human beings and personalities involved automatically make the process Christian. By the same process it is more truly religious. It is incidentally Christian because the qualities of concern are emphasized in Christian theology and the Christian tradition.

The negative points which have been given do not represent our opinion of the total value of Mr. Bonthius' paper. We feel that it is not only well done, but that we are more in agreement than disagreement.

III

George H. Ball
Director of Religious Activities
Hamline University

It is possible that Bonthius comes out at a point opposite to the one he aims at. It seems to me that his paper could be used to support the conclusion that there is no such thing as Christian counseling. That a counselor in the act of counseling consciously demonstrates love for the counselee does not make the counseling Christian. It only describes the motivation of the counselor. If the point is that one could undertake the responsibility of counseling as a way of offering Christian love to mankind, it would readily be accepted. But this does not make the counseling itself Christian, as I see it.

The counseling which is described in this paper would be the same whether carried on by a Christian or a non-Christian. If it is still contended that the counseling is different and Christian when the counselor bears love for the counselee, this point could not stand unless it were also maintained that no one but a Christian understands or uses this kind of love in a counseling relationship. This last would be a point I would not care to support, and I am sure that Bonthius is not making it.

To put the matter conversely, I do not see from the paper but that a Christian and a non-Christian counselor when functioning as counselors would handle the counselee in precisely the same fashion. Each counselor would be seeking to help the counselee "to see himself as he is and decide what he is going to do about it."

The foregoing comments may seem the wrong way to agree wholeheartedly with Section III of the paper, but I do agree. If what Bonthius describes is Christian counseling, then I'm for Christian counseling. But I think the word Christian should be used here only to describe the motivation and mission of the counselor but not his counseling. A man may be a good Christian and yet be either a good or a bad counselor (in precisely the ways Bonthius has described), just as a man may be a good Christian and be either a good or bad teacher.

A comment on a minor point in Section I of the paper: it seems to me that it would be hard to locate more useless information than to catalog the "channels to counseling." If a chaplain has that combination of love and skill so well described in the paper, then not even his leprosy would keep students from seeking his help. Every activity of his would be a kind of invitation to counseling, and the answer to a questionnaire on channels to counseling would be merely a listing of all the responsibilities of his position. Last week, we had on our campus a Religious Emphasis Week speaker whom the students immediately sensed to be a man of compassion, profound psychological understanding, and wide experience. They sought him out for counseling with such insistence that he had to begin his appointments at 7:30 a.m. No catalog could have substituted for this.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CHAPLAINS

"Membership shall consist of Chaplains, Deans of Chapels, Directors of Religi Activities, and such other administratively employed and/or designated personne are responsible for the total religious program of the college and university commun Affiliate Membership shall consist of such other persons as are engaged or activ interested in the work of religion in higher education who request to be so enro and who pay annual Association dues."

Officers and Executive Committee

1957 - 1958

PRESIDENT

George Bean
United States Military Academy

VICE PRESIDENT

Robert H. Bonthius
Vassar College

ASSOCIATION SECRETARY

Ralph G. Dunlop
Northwestern University

MEMBERSHIP SECRETARY

Robert H. Beaven
University of Rochester

TREASURER

James Hudson
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College

EDITOR OF PUBLICATIONS

Charles W. Havice
Northeastern University

PAST PRESIDENT

E. C. Reckard
Brown University

HISTORIAN

Seymour A. Smith
Yale Divinity School

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Daniel G. Hill '58
Howard University

George Kalbfleisch '58
Dartmouth College

Holmes N. Vanderbeck '59
Springfield College

Harry H. Kruener '59
Denison University

Robert M. Minto '60
Stanford University

William J. Simmons '60
Tennessee State University

Committee on Publications

Charles Havice, Chairman
Northeastern University

Andrew J. Hargrett, Vice Chairman
Savannah State College

Albert L. Seely
University of Massachusetts

Robert Rankin
Claremont Colleges

Harry H. Kruener
Denison University

Richard Unsworth
Smith College

E. C. Reckard
Brown University